

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 26, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over any of U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,120 to Rother (hereinafter "ROTHER"), U.S. Pat. No. 6,725,137 to Eagleton, et al. (hereinafter "EAGLETON"), or U.S. Pat. No. 6,807,469 to Funkhouser, et al. (hereinafter "FUNKHOUSER").

1. Summary of Claim Amendments

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's noting the typographical error in Claim 28 and examining the claims presuming dependency to Claim 25 instead of Claim 225. By the present amendment, Applicant has corrected this error.

2. Claims 1-33 are not obvious over ROTHER

In the subject Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-33 as being obvious over ROTHER. As the Examiner asserts, ROTHER teaches a vehicle diagnostic system which receives vehicle error codes from a database, correlates the error codes to applicable causes and related procedures, ranks applicable causes, and performs tests correlated with those causes.

Applicant respectfully submits that as understood, ROTHER does not teach or suggest all of the features as set forth in the Applicant's invention. As exemplary of the features set forth in the other independent claims, Claim 1 recites: "a code parser for parsing the received diagnostic codes into diagnostic code segments; a code translator for correlating diagnostic code segments to corresponding diagnostic descriptor segments; and a combiner for combining the code descriptor segments to derive composite diagnostic code descriptors..." Applicant further submits that independent Claims 6, 15, 20, 25, and 29 each claim features that are likewise directed to parsing a received error code into multiple segments and producing a combined human-readable error message.

As described in paragraph [0031] of Applicant's disclosure, parsing the code descriptor into segments makes it unnecessary to store a complete code descriptor for each

code. Therefore, the code descriptor storage requirements may be reduced to the point that multiple vehicle codes may be stored on the tool without the need for compression techniques or multiple interchangeable cartridges. As such, Applicant's invention is particularly beneficial in diagnostic tools with limited memory. The ROTHER apparatus apparently does not teach or suggest such features, as the system is based on a Personal Computer where memory to store long lists of *complete* diagnostic codes is available. None of the functions as set forth in the present invention would therefore appear to be necessary, and for this reason it is not taught nor suggested.

With regard to dependent claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 30-33, Applicant respectfully submits that the same depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 25, and 29, respectively, and recite additional features that further define the invention. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that Claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 30-33 are not obvious over ROTHER.

3. Claims 1-33 are not obvious over EAGLETON

In the Office Action the Examiner also rejected Claims 1-33 as being obvious over EAGLETON, which apparently teaches a maintenance system that receives multiple error codes and formulates a repair strategy, including "fault isolation, material planning, and deferral/criticality analysis..." based on historical data. (See col. 1, lines 38-41) Applicant notes that, as understood, deferral analysis in the context of EAGLETON refers to "identify[ing] the set of fault conditions for which the aircraft can be safely operated."

Applicant respectfully submits that EAGLETON does not appear to teach or suggest all of the features as set forth in the present invention. While EAGLETON generally concerns the processing of error codes, there is no apparent teaching or suggestion to parse the received codes into discrete segments, because EAGLETON concerns correlating error codes with historical data to provide an overall picture of the system being maintained. As is understood by Applicant, each error code is correlated with one fault condition, and the relevancy and criticality of that one fault condition, in turn, is determined based on its previously assigned importance.

Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 25, and 29, however, relates to producing human-readable fault messages from otherwise incomprehensible error codes, and does so in the most memory efficient manner. As discussed *supra*, this is accomplished by segmenting the error codes and correlating a word to that segment, then combining the segments to produce the fault message. Unlike EAGLETON, Applicant's invention contemplates limited memory in which to store human-readable fault messages. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that EAGLETON does not render the Applicant's invention obvious.

With regard to dependent claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 30-33, Applicant respectfully submits that the same depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 25, and 29, respectively, and recite additional features that further define the invention. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that Claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 30-33 are not obvious over EAGLETON, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

4. Claims 1-33 are not obvious over FUNKHOUSER

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-33 over FUNKHOUSER, asserting that a system for receiving error codes from the vehicle and processing the codes from a database to correlate the error codes to specific vehicle malfunction conditions was taught. Applicant respectfully submits that, as understood, FUNKHOUSER does not teach the parsing of the received error code into segments and producing a resultant composite error message, and accordingly does not teach or suggest all of the features as set forth in independent Claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 25, and 29.

More specifically, FUNKHOUSER apparently teaches a system wherein vehicle error codes are retrieved, and transferred to a personal computer. These codes are then correlated with fault message data residing on a remote web server, which is accessed by the personal computer through an internet connection. Indeed, FUNKHOUSER recognizes that "...the processing speed required to correlate the error codes with the error code database information, and the display capabilities required to display information about the problems discovered during the processing of the error codes comprises expensive components." *See*

Application No.: 10/759,655
Response to Office Action of June 26, 2005
Attorney Docket: EQUUS-105A


col. 7, lines 4-10. Further, FUNKHOUSER also recognizes that "error database information that exists for all of the vehicles is quite large, thus requiring a significant amount of memory capability and processing speed." *See* col. 7, lines 38-40.

Applicant respectfully submits that FUNKHOUSER discourages processing a composite error message and displaying the same on a hand held unit as claimed by the Applicant. Thus, FUNKHOUSER does not appear to teach or suggest an apparatus which parses error codes into segments and combining correlated error words to form such a composite error message, as such a feature would be unnecessary when entire error codes are correlated with data on a remote server having far greater processing capabilities. Applicant submits that FUNKHOUSER does not render Claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 25, and 29 obvious, and is in condition for allowance. Moreover, Applicant submits that Claims 2-5, 7-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 30-33 are also allowable for its dependence on respective allowable independent claims.

5. Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of Claims 1-33 of the present application. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct 10, 2005 By: 
Customer No.: 007663
Bruce B. Brunda
Registration No. 28,497
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER
75 Enterprise, Suite 250
Aliso Viejo, California 92656
Telephone: (949) 855-1246
Fax: (949) 855-6371

Application No.: 10/759,655
Response to Office Action of June 26, 2005
Attorney Docket: EQUUS-105A

T:\Client Documents\EQUUS\105a\Response to August 26, 2005 Office Action.doc
BBB:SSS